



Attorney's Docket No. 99-852

Patent

2700 AF

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of )

Gabriel JACKOBSON et al )

Application No.: 09/557,071 )

Filed: May 23, )

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR )  
PROVIDING REAL-TIME )  
ADVANCED CORRELATION )  
ENVIRONMENT )  
ARCHITECTURE )

Group Art Unit: 2162

Examiner: Li B. ZHEN

RECEIVED

FEB 05 2004

GROUP 3600

TRANSMITTAL FOR APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
Sir:

Transmitted herewith in triplicate is an Appeal Brief in support of the Notice of Appeal  
filed November 24, 2003.

Enclosed is a check for ☐ \$165.00 ☐ \$330.00 to cover the Government fee.

☒ Charge \$330.00 to Deposit Account No. 07-2347 for the fee due.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any other appropriate fees that may be  
required by this paper that are not accounted for above, and to credit any overpayment, to  
Deposit Account No. 07-2347. This paper is submitted in triplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.

By:

Joel Wall  
Reg. No. 25,640

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.  
600 Hidden Ridge Drive  
Mail Code: HQE03H14  
Irving, Texas 75038  
(972) 718-4800

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 32127

Date: January 23, 2004



#15/App 1B-11  
PATENT  
Customer No. 32,127  
Attorney Docket No. 99-852

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of: )  
)  
Gabriel JAKOBSON et al. ) Group Art Unit: 2126  
)  
Application No.: 09/577,071 ) Examiner: Li B. ZHEN  
)  
Filed: May 23, 2000 )  
)  
For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR )  
PROVIDING A GLOBAL REAL-TIME )  
ADVANCED CORRELATION )  
ENVIRONMENT ARCHITECTURE )

Mail Stop Appeal Brief -- Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED  
FEB 05 2004  
GROUP 3600

Sir:

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192

Appellants submit this Brief on Appeal in response to the final rejection of claims 1-33 in the final Office Action dated July 23, 2003. Claims 1-33 are the only claims pending in this application, and the Appendix contains the current state of these claims. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.192, this Brief is timely filed in triplicate subsequent to a corresponding Notice of Appeal filed on November 24, 2003, accompanied with the requisite fee of \$330.00. If any additional fees are due, Appellants request that these fees be charged to our Deposit Account No. 07-2347.

01/30/2004 HAHMED1 00000024 072347 09557071

01 FC:1402 330.00 DA

**I. Real Party In Interest**

The real party in interest is GTE Service Corporation, as indicated by an assignment recorded on DATE, in Reel NUMBER at Frame NUMBER CHRIS –  
**PLEASE FILL IN THE DATA.**

**II. Related Appeals and Interferences**

Appellants know of no other related appeals or interferences that may have a bearing on the Board's decision in the current appeal.

**III. Status Of Claims**

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application. All pending claims are subject to rejection in a final Office Action dated July 23, 2003. In that final Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim amendments made by a May 15, 2003, Amendment under 35 U.S.C. § 132 because the Examiner alleged they introduced new matter into the disclosure; the Examiner objected to the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach certain claim elements; and the Examiner rejected claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Examiner also rejected claims 16, 17, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jacobs (U.S. Patent No. 5,761,502); rejected claims 1-7, 18, 19, 22, 25, 28, 29, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs in view of Lawson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,721,825); and rejected claims 8-15, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs and Lawson in view of Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,477,585).

In an Advisory Action dated November 6, 2003; the Examiner withdrew the objection to the claim amendments under 35 U.S.C. § 132. However, the Examiner refused to withdraw the remaining final rejections. Appellants accordingly appeal the final rejection of claims 1-33.

**IV. Status Of Amendments**

Subsequent to the final Office Action, Appellants submitted a Request for Reconsideration on October 22, 2003, without amending any claims. Accordingly, all claim amendments have been entered.

**V. Summary Of Invention**

Systems and methods consistent with the present invention relate to client-server computer networks and implement an apparatus and method for correlating network events among a number of client services. In a data processing apparatus for correlating network events among a number of client services, at least one computer includes program instructions and a processor configured to use the program instructions to provide a network management service and an event notification service. In addition, the apparatus includes a network mediation service adapted to receive a raw event from an external computer network and transmit the raw event to the event notification service.

The apparatus further includes a message parsing service adapted to receive a raw event from the event notification service, parse the raw event, and transmit the parsed event to the event notification service. Further, the apparatus includes an event correlation service coupled to a knowledge database and adapted to receive the parsed

event from the event notification service, use data stored in the knowledge database to derive an event from the parsed event, and transmit the derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations via the event notification service, regardless of a significance of the derived event. The network mediation, message parsing, event notification and network management services are coupled together via a plurality of interfaces.

## **VI. Issues**

The first issue on appeal is whether the objection to the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is proper when the specification was not amended.

The second issue on appeal is whether the rejection of claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is proper when claims 1-33 have support in the specification and thus comply with the written description requirement.

The third issue on appeal is whether the rejection of claims 16, 17, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is proper when the only applied reference fails to teach “transmitting said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations, regardless of a significance of a derived event,” as recited by claims 16, 17, and 32.

The fourth issue on appeal is whether the rejection of claims 1-7, 18, 19, 22, 25, 28, 29, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is proper when the only applied references fail to teach or suggest transmitting “said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations via said event notification service, regardless of a significance of said derived event” or “transmitting said parsed event to said network management service, regardless of a significance of said parsed event.”

The fifth issue on appeal is whether the rejection of claims 8-15, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is proper when the only applied references fail to teach or suggest transmitting “said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations via said event notification service, regardless of a significance of said derived event” or “transmitting said parsed event to said network management service, regardless of a significance of said parsed event.”

## **VII. Grouping Of Claims**

In the claims on appeal, claims 1, 16, 18, 28, 32, and 33 are the independent claims. The claims on appeal do not stand or fall together, but rather should be considered in three groups:

Group I: 16, 17, and 32;

Group II: 1-7, 18, 19, 22, 25, 28, 29, and 33; and

Group III: 8-15, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, and 31.

The claims have been placed in these groups due to their common subject matter and due to the manner of the Examiner’s rejections. However, Appellants have addressed the outstanding rejections based on the rejections themselves instead of based solely on this grouping.

## **VIII. Argument**

### **A. The Objection to the Specification is Improper Because Appellants Did Not Amend the Specification**

The first issue on appeal is whether the objection to the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is proper when the specification was not amended.

The Examiner objected to the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach certain claim elements. Appellants respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner's objection for at least the following reasons.

Appellants note that M.P.E.P. § 2163.06 states, in pertinent part, that if new subject matter is added to the disclosure, whether it be in the abstract, the specification, or the drawings, the examiner should object to the introduction of new matter under 35 U.S.C. §§ 132 or 251 as appropriate, and require applicant to cancel the new matter. However, if new matter is added to the claims, the examiner should reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph's written description requirement. See M.P.E.P. § 2163.06 (8<sup>th</sup> ed. 2001).

Applicants' response filed May 13, 2003 did not introduce new matter into the disclosure. Instead, the response included amendments to claims 1, 16, 18, 29, 32, and 33 (See Response filed May 13, 2003, p. 2). Accordingly, because the Examiner's objection is directed to amendments to the claims, and not to an amendment of the specification, this objection to the specification is improper. For at least this reason, Applicants request that the Board reverse the Examiner's objection to the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

**B. Claims 1-33 Comply with the Written Description Requirement**

Appellants request that the Board reverse the rejection of claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement for at least the following reasons.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner refers to the recitation “regardless of a significance of said derived event” added to claims 1, 16, 18, 32, and 33, and the recitation “regardless of a significance of said parsed event” added to claim 28, alleging the specification fails to adequately teach these recitations. Appellants respectfully submit that these recitations are supported by Appellants’ originally filed specification.

The specification, at page 15, lines 3-11 of Appellants’ disclosure states, in part, “[i]n operation, the event notification service receives an unparsed message or event from the network mediation service and then passes the message to the message parsing service for processing. After the message has been parsed by the message parsing service, it is passed back to the event notification service, which passes the messages along an event channel to the network management service. The message is also passed to the even correlation service for event correlation.” In addition, the specification, at page 25, lines 12-15 of Appellants’ disclosure states “[c]orrelation engine 505 is responsible for accepting incoming events from event notification service 40, interpreting the events, and passing the derived (correlated) events back to event notification service 40.” These exemplary recitations teach the transmission of the derived and parsed events as recited in claims 1, 16, 18, 28, 32, and 33. Moreover, these recitations unequivocally indicate that no conditions are attached. Therefore, the recitations “regardless of a significance of said derived event” and “regardless of a significance of said parsed event,” as recited in claims 1, 16, 18, 28, 32, and 33 are inherently disclosed by the specification.

As set forth in M.P.E.P. § 2163.07(a), by disclosing in a patent application a device that inherently performs a function or has a property, operates according to a



theory or has an advantage, a patent application necessarily discloses that function, theory or advantage, even though it says nothing explicit concerning it. The application may later be amended to recite the function, theory or advantage without introducing prohibited new matter. See M.P.E.P. § 2163.07(a) (8<sup>th</sup> ed. 2001), citing *In re Reynolds*, 443 F.2d 384, 170 USPQ 94 (CCPA 1971); *In re Smythe*, 480 F. 2d 1376, 178 USPQ 279 (CCPA 1973). The phrases “regardless of a significance of said derived event” and “regardless of a significance of said parsed event,” meet this requirement because these phrases recite the advantage of passing all messages of a particular type for processing, as is consistent with the specification. Accordingly, Appellants request the Board to reverse the objection to the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

**C. Jacobs Does Not Teach Transmitting A Derived Event to One of a Plurality of Operator Workstations, Regardless of a Significance of a Derived Event**

The Examiner rejected claims 16, 17, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jacobs. Appellants respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner’s rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order to properly anticipate Appellants’ claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), each and every element of the claim in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” See M.P.E.P. § 2121 (8<sup>th</sup> ed., Aug. 2001), *quoting* Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Finally, “[t]he

elements must be arranged as required by the claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131 (8<sup>th</sup> ed. 2001), p. 2100-69.

Independent claim 16 recites a combination including, among other things, “transmitting said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations, regardless of a significance of a derived event.” Jacobs does not disclose at least this feature of claim 16 and thus does not anticipate the claim.

Jacobs discloses a system and method for managing telecommunications networks. In particular, Jacobs discloses using a state filter to determine whether a state change of a transmission segment is significant enough to report. See col. 12, lines 8-10. In that regard, Jacobs discloses that when the state filter determines that the state change is not significant, the process ends. When the state filter determines that the state change is significant, the process proceeds and sends a notification message of the state change. See col. 12, lines 22-27. Thus, any transmission of events in Jacobs is expressly conditional on the significance of the event.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action on page 15, the Examiner alleges that the “derived event” recited in claim 16 is anticipated by Jacobs at col. 9, lines 38-62. Even if this were true, it is irrelevant and does not alter the fact that Jacobs teaches that any transmission of an “event” is conditional on its significance. Jacobs thus does not anticipate at least “transmitting said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations, regardless of a significance of a derived event,” as recited in claim 16. Accordingly, the Board should reverse the Examiner’s rejection of claim 16.

Claim 32 includes recitations similar in scope to those of claim 16 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above. Claim 17 depends from claim 16. Accordingly, claim 17 is deemed allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with base claim 16.

**D. Jacobs and Lawson Do Not Disclose or Suggest Transmitting an Event to One of a Plurality of Operator Workstations Via an Event Notification Service, Regardless of a Significance of the Event**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 18, 19, 22, 25, 28, 29, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs in view of Lawson. Appellants respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection for at least the following reasons.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). Jacobs and Lawson, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest every element of the claimed invention, which defeats the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1, 18, and 33 recite a combination including, among other things, transmitting "said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations via said event notification service, regardless of a significance of said derived event." Claim 28 recites a combination including, among other things, "transmitting said parsed event to said network management service, regardless of a significance of said parsed event."

As discussed above, Jacobs fails to teach at least these features of Applicants' claimed invention. Although Lawson discloses a system and method for global event

notification in a distributed computer environment, it does not make up for the deficiencies of Jacobs.

As disclosed by Lawson, the system and method allows local event consumers to register for notification of an event and then sends notification of events that occur to registered local event consumers. See col. 4, lines 33-36. However, Lawson does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claims 1, 18, 28, and 33. In particular, Lawson does not disclose or suggest transmitting "said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations via said event notification service, regardless of a significance of said derived event," as recited in claims 1, 18, and 33 nor "transmitting said parsed event to said network management service, regardless of a significance of said parsed event," as recited in claim 28. For at least this reason the rejection of claims 1, 18, 28, and 33 as obvious over Jacobs in view of Lawson is improper.

Additionally, neither Jacobs nor Lawson disclose or suggest an "event notification service," which, among other things, "receives a raw event, transmits the raw event to an event correlation service, which transmits the parsed raw event back to the event notification service, which then transmits the derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations," as recited in claim 1, for example. The Examiner has not pointed out any teachings of either Jacobs or Lawson that constitutes an "event notification service," which, among other things, "receives a raw event, transmits the raw event to an event correlation service, which transmits the parsed raw event back to the event notification service, which then transmits the derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, at least these elements of claim 1 are missing from the cited references for this additional reason.

Further, even if Jacobs and Lawson taught the elements of claims 1, 18, 28, and 33 (which they do not), there is no suggestion or motivation to combine these references. The Examiner alleges because “both Jacobs and Lawson teaches event distribution across a network, it would have been obvious [that] the invention of Jacobs would also include network mediation service in order for the network elements to communicate across different network domains” (Final Office Action, page 7). Appellants respectfully submit that such an allegation by the Examiner does not establish a proper motivation for combining Jacobs and Lawson or modifying the teachings thereof to arrive at the claimed combination, as required by M.P.E.P. § 2143.

Nor has the Examiner demonstrated a reasonable expectation of success for making the proposed combination. For at least the above reasons, the Board should reverse the rejection of claims 1, 18, 28, and 33. The Board should also reverse the rejection of dependent claims 2-7, 19, 22, and 29 because these additional claims include allowable subject matter as recited in their respective independent claims.

**E. Jacobs, Lawson, and Cohen Do Not Disclose or Suggest Transmitting an Event to One of a Plurality of Operator Workstations Via an Event Notification Service, Regardless of a Significance of the Event**

The Examiner rejected claims 8-15, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs and Lawson in view of Cohen. Appellants respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner’s rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, Jacobs and Lawson do not teach or suggest at least transmitting “said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations via said

event notification service, regardless of a significance of said derived event,” as recited in claims 1, 18, and 33. Nor do Jacobs and Lawson disclose or suggest at least “transmitting said parsed event to said network management service, regardless of a significance of said parsed event,” as recited in claim 28.

Although Cohen discloses an event management service used in a distributed computing environment, Cohen includes a filter mechanism for determining whether events generated by one or more even supplies are communicated to one or more even consumers. Thus, transmission is conditional, and Cohen fails to cure the deficiencies of Jacobs and Lawson. Accordingly, neither Jacobs, Lawson, and Cohen disclose or suggest at the exemplary recitations of claims 1, 18, 28, and 33, as discussed above.

Claims 8-15, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, and 31 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 18, and 28. For at least the same reasons set for above for claims 1, 18, and 28, claims 8-15, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, and 31 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Jacobs, Lawson, and Cohen.

**Conclusion**

For the reasons given above, Appellants request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the Examiner's final rejections of claims 1-33.

To the extent any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this Appeal Brief, such extension is hereby respectfully requested. If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 07-2347

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 23, 2004

By:  \_\_\_\_\_

Joel Wall  
Reg. No. 25,648

Post Office Address (to which  
correspondence is to be sent)

Verizon Corporate Services Group, Inc.  
600 Hidden Ridge Drive  
Irving, TX 75038  
(972) 718-4800

**APPENDIX**

1. A data processing apparatus for correlating network events among a number of client services comprising:

at least one computer comprising:

a memory having program instructions; and

a processor configured to use said program instructions to provide:

a network management service;

an event notification service;

a network mediation service adapted to:

receive a raw event from an external computer network; and

transmit said raw event to said event notification service;

a message parsing service adapted to:

receive a raw event from said event notification service;

parse said raw event; and

transmit said parsed event to said event notification service;

and

an event correlation service coupled to a knowledge

database comprising correlation knowledge, said event

correlation service adapted to:

receive said parsed event from said event notification  
service;

utilize data stored in said knowledge database to

derive an event from said parsed event; and



transmit said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations via said event notification service, regardless of a significance of said derived event;

wherein said network mediation, message parsing, event notification and network management services are coupled together via a plurality of interfaces.

2. The data processing apparatus of claim 1, wherein said network mediation service is adapted to interface with at least one external computer network.

3. The data processing apparatus of claim 2, wherein said network mediation service is further adapted to:

receive a raw event at said network mediation service from said external computer network; and

transmit said raw event to said message parsing service.

4. The data processing apparatus of claim 1, wherein said message parsing service is adapted to receive a raw event from said network mediation service and produce a parsed event.

5. The data processing apparatus of claim 4, wherein said message parsing service is adapted to route said parsed event to said network management service via said event notification service.

6. The data processing apparatus of claim 5, wherein said message parsing service is adapted to route said parsed event to said event correlation service via said event notification service.

7. The data processing apparatus of claim 1, wherein said network management service is adapted to interface with a plurality of operator workstations.

8. The data processing apparatus of claim 1, wherein said network management service is further adapted to:

receive data requests from said plurality of operator workstations; and  
transmit said data requests to said event correlation service via said event notification service.

9. The data processing apparatus of claim 4, wherein said event notification service is further comprised of:

a raw event channel;  
a parsed event channel; and  
a derived event channel.

10. The data processing apparatus of claim 9, wherein said event notification service is further comprised of at least one filter.

11. The data processing apparatus of claim 10, wherein said at least one filter is coupled to at least one of said plurality of event channels.

12. The data processing apparatus of claim 9, wherein said raw event channel is adapted to:

receive a raw event from said network mediation service; and  
transmit said raw event to said message parsing service.

13. The data processing apparatus of claim 9, wherein said parsed event channel is adapted to:

receive a raw event from said message parsing service; and  
transmit said raw event to said network management service.

14. The data processing apparatus of claim 9, wherein said parsed event channel is adapted to:

receive a parsed event from said message parsing service; and  
transmit said parsed event to said event correlation service.

15. The data processing apparatus of claim 9, wherein said derived event channel is adapted to:

receive a derived event from said event correlation service; and  
transmit said derived event to network management service.

16. A method for correlating network event messages on a computer network comprising a message parsing service, an event correlation service, and a knowledge database coupled together via a plurality of interfaces, said method comprising the steps of:

- receiving a raw event at said message parsing service;
- parsing said raw event by said message parsing service;
- transmitting said parsed event to said event correlation service;
- utilizing data stored in said knowledge database to derive an event from said parsed event; and
- transmitting said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations, regardless of a significance of said derived event.

17. The method of claim 16, wherein said step of transmitting said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations, further comprising the following steps:

- transmitting said derived event from said event correlation service to a network management service; and
- transmitting said derived event from said network management service to one of a plurality of operator workstations.

18. A method for correlating network event messages on a computer network comprising a network mediation service, a message parsing service, an event

notification service, an event correlation service, and a knowledge database coupled together via a plurality of interfaces, said method comprising the steps of:

- receiving a raw event at said network mediation service from an external computer network;

- transmitting said raw event to said message parsing service;

- parsing said raw event by said message parsing service;

- transmitting said parsed event to said event correlation service;

- utilizing data stored in said knowledge database to derive an event from said parsed event; and

- transmitting said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations, regardless of a significance of said derived event.

19. The method of claim 18, wherein said step of transmitting said raw event to said message parsing service, further comprises the steps of:

- transmitting said raw event from said network mediation service to said event notification service; and

- transmitting said raw event from said event notification service to said message parsing service.

20. The method of claim 19, wherein the step of transmitting said raw event from said event notification service to said message parsing service, further comprises the following steps:

- receiving said raw event at a raw event channel;

processing said raw event by said raw event channel; and  
transmitting said raw event from said raw event channel to said message  
parsing service.

21. The method of claim 20, wherein said step of transmitting said raw event  
from said raw event channel to said message parsing service, further comprises the  
following steps of:

transmitting said raw event from said raw event channel to at least one  
event filter; and

transmitting said raw event from said at least one event filter to said  
message parsing service.

22. The method of claim 18, wherein said step of transmitting said parsed  
event to said event correlation service, further comprises the steps of:

transmitting said parsed event from said message parsing service to said  
event notification service; and

transmitting said parsed event from said event notification service to said  
event correlation service.

23. The method of claim 22, wherein the step of transmitting said parsed  
event from said event notification service to said event correlation service, further  
comprises the following steps:

receiving said parsed event at a parsed event channel;

processing said parsed event by said parsed event channel; and  
transmitting said processed event from said parsed event channel to said  
event correlation service.

24. The method of claim 23, wherein said step of transmitting said processed  
event from said parsed event channel to said event correlation service, further  
comprises the following steps:

transmitting said processed event from said parsed event channel to at  
least one event filter; and

transmitting said processed event from said at least one event filter to said  
event correlation service.

25. The method of claim 18, wherein said step of transmitting said derived  
event to one of a plurality of operator workstations, further comprises the steps of:

transmitting said derived event from said event correlation service to said  
event notification service; and

transmitting said derived event from said event notification service to said  
network management service; and

transmitting said derived event from said network management service to  
one of a plurality of operator workstations.

26. The method of claim 25, wherein the step of transmitting said derived event from said network management service to one of a plurality of operator workstations, further comprises the following steps:

receiving said derived event at a derived event channel;

processing said derived event by said derived event channel; and

transmitting said processed event from said derived event channel to said network management service.

27. The method of claim 26, wherein the step of transmitting said processed event from said derived event channel to said network management service, further comprises the following steps:

transmitting said processed event from said derived event channel to at least one event filter; and

transmitting said processed event from said at least one event filter to said network management service.

28. A method for correlating network event messages on a computer network comprising a network mediation service, a message parsing service, an event notification service, and a network management service coupled together via a plurality of interfaces, said method comprising the steps of:

receiving a raw event at said network mediation service from an external computer network;

transmitting said raw event to said message parsing service;



parsing said raw event by said message parsing service;  
transmitting said parsed event to said network management service,  
regardless of a significance of said parsed event.

29. The method of claim 28, wherein said step of transmitting said parsed event to said network management service, further comprises the steps of:

transmitting said parsed event from said message parsing service to said event notification service; and

transmitting said parsed event from said event notification service to said network management service.

30. The method of claim 29, wherein the step of transmitting said parsed event from said event notification service to said network management service, further comprises the following steps:

receiving said parsed event at a parsed event channel;

processing said parsed event by said parsed event channel; and

transmitting said processed event from said parsed event channel to said network management service.

31. The method of claim 30, wherein said step of transmitting said processed event from said parsed event channel to said network management service, further comprises the following steps of:

transmitting said processed event from said parsed event channel to at least one event filter; and

transmitting said processed event from said at least one event filter to said network management service.

32. A data processing apparatus for correlating network events among a number of client services comprising:

means for receiving a raw event at a message parsing service;

means for parsing said raw event by said message parsing service;

means for transmitting said parsed event to an event correlation service;

means for utilizing data stored in a knowledge database to derive an event from said parsed event; and

means for transmitting said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations, regardless of a significance of said derived event.

33. A computer system for correlating network events among a number of client services comprising:

a memory having program instructions; and

a processor configured to use the program instructions to receive a raw event at a network mediation service from an external computer network; to transmit said raw event to a message parsing service; to parse said raw event by said message parsing service; to transmit said parsed event to a event correlation service; to utilize data stored in a knowledge database to derive an event from said parsed event; and to

transmit said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations, regardless of a significance of said derived event.